The Familiar Compound Ghost : Burial and Disinterment in Daniel Martin

AUTHOR(S):

Itakura, Gen'ichiro

CITATION:

Itakura, Gen'ichiro. The Familiar Compound Ghost : Burial and Disinterment in Daniel Martin. Zephyr 1998, 12: 1-19

ISSUE DATE:

1998-11-10

URL:

https://doi.org/10.14989/87582

The Familiar Compound Ghost

Burial and Disinterment in *Daniel Martin*

Gen'ichiro Itakura

Daniel Martin is the least well-received of John Fowles's full-length works; yet its incessant play with tense and narration and its circular form should deserve a close look. The novel ends with a modernist, 'self-begetting' closure at which, after his long tortuous search for a vocation, the hero is finally able to compose the novel the reader has just finished reading.[1] Fowles gives a twist to this modern tradition; unlike Proust's Marcel, Daniel Martin, a frustrated intellectual in the typical Fowles mould, is not permitted to claim to being the author of the book.

> . . . Dan told [Jane] with a suitable irony that at least he had found a last sentence for the novel he was never going to write. She laughed at such flagrant Irishry; which is perhaps why, in the end, and in the knowledge that Dan's novel can never be read, lies eternally in the future, his ill-concealed ghost has made that impossible last his own impossible first.[2]

The whole account of Dan's life is, as it turns out, formatted into a novel by his 'ill-concealed ghost' to whom the narrator refers in the third person in the last sentence of the above extract, so that both Dan and his 'ill-concealed ghost,' Fowles himself, are incorporated into the same text.[3] The reader is thus lifted on a metafictional level from which one can see that ghost creating order and meaning out of fragmented pieces of stories. The 'ill-concealed

ghost' is a well-chosen phrase for two reasons to say the least: for one thing, the author's voice is internalised in Dan's just as what Dan calls a ghost gradually possesses him; for the other, while shaping Dan's life into a work of art, the author is also governed by Dan's notion of the ghost. The 'ghost' is actually one of the most frequently used images in this book,[4] and has significant implications which will certainly warrant critical attention.

1

'The dead live', says Mauris Conchis in *The Magus*, '[by] love'[5]; however, he only fakes up resurrection through impersonation. In *Daniel Martin*, the dead live only within the realm of Dan's memory: Aunt Millie, his family's now long-dead housekeeper, for example, is vividly remembered as if living. This applies to the cases of those who are not actually dead but 'dead' in his imagination; such an imaginary death, mostly a separation after a traumatic experience, matters much to Dan. He is neither imaginative nor nostalgic; he tries to be realistic, banishing these 'dead' into oblivion. However, the memories of the 'dead' haunt him like a ghost with some unruly force that frustrates all his effort to exorcise them; besides, they are claiming the mercy of proper burial. In the middle of the book, Dan meets Nancy Reed, his first love, whom his father has once told him not to see. The sudden decree of separation has had a traumatic effect upon the adolescent Dan. As he admits to her, the wistful memories of the farm house, their 'Garden of Eden' (380), and what happened there have haunted him '[like] a ghost'; he is tempted to tell her that he has nearly fallen into the error of repressing them:

> Even if I'd only evoked a remembered bitterness, recrimination, it would have been better than that total burial, that vile, stupid and inhuman pretense that our pasts are not also our presents; that what we did and

felt was in some way evil and absurd . . . immature. (407)

The 'total burial', repression of the past memories, does not provide any solution to unresolved problems behind them. The young Nancy, unlike the middle-aged one, has been an emblem for things lost, or more precisely, deprived: the lost mother in particular. Although Dan hardly remembers his dead mother, he does recognise her in Nancy's generosity and sexual attractions: 'her lips tasted of thyme and caraway seeds, her body was his lost mother's, her giving forgave in a few seconds all he had thought he could never forgive' (383). With this problem of the lost mother unresolved, Dan cannot escape from Nancy's ghost, which is also his mother's.[6]

Dan has tried in vain to escape from these 'ghosts', his unresolved, irrecoverable pasts, until he finally learns to face up to them. Dan publishes a play titled *The Empty Church* to 'exorcize my father's ghost from my life' (144). Likewise, he writes his memoirs to exorcise the ghosts of Marjory and Miriam, which '[haunt him], as the dead haunt, making missed opportunities eternal—and making even this exorcism by the written word a vain and empty thing' (270). In both cases, Dan's verbal exorcism turns out a complete failure; nothing can compensate for his feeling of loss. After all, Dan learns he should live with these ghosts, instead of exorcising them. He buys the Thorncombe house, which has once belonged to the Reeds, hoping to 'buy ghosts', to live with the traumatic memories which otherwise he would dishonestly repress (312); and actually he senses 'the ghosts of all others in that house' (368). His return to Thorncombe is in this respect his attempt to conjure the ghosts, or to 'disinter' the dead if using another image frequently used in the book.

2

In terms of Dan's private ritual of burial, exorcism and disinterment,

the most interesting case is provided by his relationship with his now dead father. Dan's rebellious adolescence echoes that of Nicholas Urfe in *The Magus*, who more startlingly resembles the middle-aged Dan in their lack of sincerity in relationships with women: they face much the same situation (their mistresses' suicide attempt), use the same imagery ('mongrel') for the innocent girls they patronise, and have the similar dual affair with women of opposite character.[7] In Nicholas's case, the habitual withdrawal from any meaningful relationships results from the unhappy phase of his childhood, when he began constructing barriers to keep his father away from his life; his case is, in short, an exemplary one of 'only partly resolved Oedipal complex'.[8] In *Daniel Martin*, this Fowlesian version of family romance is restaged with full awareness of the Freudian paradigm.

As early as in the first chapter 'The Harvest', the classic paradigm manifests itself in the young Dan's sense of solitude: he is 'nursing his solitude, his terrible Oedipal secret; already at the crossroads every son must pass' (15). A more detailed explanation is given in the chapter titled 'The Umbrella', in which, as he is flying to his hometown, he imagines himself flying to 'an empty space', his childhood and unresolved past (81). Despite his oldness (82) and dullness (85), his father always exercises a certain kind of patriarchal power over his only son. He always represses what he really fears: he holds back 'any nakedness of feeling' and restrains Dan from 'demonstrating', showing joy or grief (84); and, because of his faith in 'order' or fear of chaos, he never allows Dan a doubt as to where they belong (85). His total belief in propriety and hierarchy, however, represents a negative form of patriarchy; he conditions the young Dan 'by antithesis' (83). Being increasingly defiant, Dan comes to detour around his father's censor by stealing the first volume of Robert Herrick's *Hesperides*, which sexually initiates him, and then 'rearranging the books so that no empty space showed', that is, so that his father could never notice it (89); and his father's religious and moral stricture

causes a strong backlash in Dan, who grows to be 'a fully-fledged atheist' by the age of seventeen (92), to be 'congenitally unfaithful' (189), and to 'shed unnecessary guilt, irrational respect, emotional dependence', with the result that human life seems sterile (95). In short, Dan apparently tries to 'bury' his dead father, or 'exorcise' his ghost.

Dan is not a typical case of Oedipal complex, however. Although most reluctantly, he aknowledges his sharings with, or heritage from his father. As his father feels embarrassed at Dan's 'demonstrating', Dan feels himself trapped 'between two things he fears, emotion and unreason' (49). Whilst making a distinction between his love for orchid and his father's 'mania for gardening' (87), Dan admits in the later part of the book that they do virtually the same thing in their own way; despite their differences, Dan and his father share the same defensive psychology, 'desire for stasis', or a negative form of desire for 'control, a safe place' (503). It is thus impossible for Dan to efface every trace of paternal influence, that is, to bury his father completely; his father is still living within him.

The discrepancy between words and deeds revokes of another Freudian concept, *negation*: the content of a repressed idea makes its way to consciousness, on condition that it is negated.[9] Although the Freudian theory needs modification (for Dan is not a neurotic), we can safely say that his expression of hatred towards his father is a way of taking cognizance of his repressed feelings. His acceptance of his father's legacy is subtly dramatised in the umbrella episode. When his father gives Margaret a ride on his bicycle, Dan is strongly mortified by the presence of this lower-class girl (96). On the way back home from Fishacre, Dan declines his father's offer of ride.

> 'Come on, old fellow.'
> I say nothing. He examines me. I am demonstrating.
> He says, 'Ladies first, Daniel. That's a rule of life.'

'I'm hot.'

'Do you want to ride now?'

I shake my head and avoid his eyes. I am breaking another rule, squandering all credit, by doing that (not saying, no thank you) and he knows I know it.

'Then you must walk home on your own. I have the man waiting.' I say nothing. 'Shall I take the umbrella?'

'I'll carry it.'

I will give him nothing; not even what I hate. (97)

His 'demonstrating' is one of many instances of his repudiation of the overt forms of his father's belief. However, this does not fully account for the reason why he tries to deprive his father of his prerogative by not giving back the umbrella. His father always carries this umbrella, under the pretense of worrying about the weather, but actually for the purpose of hiding 'his ill-gotten Irishman's heels and seedlings' in (87). The umbrella is a symbol for hypocrisy or ill-concealed guilt; it represents the shelter of a traditional middle-class belief system.[10] Despite encumbrance, Dan's father has to carry it; otherwise, he could never maintain dignity as a father and preacher. The umbrella constitutes a vital element that supposedly protects patriarchy, reassuring him about the safety of that system. In the above extract Dan is actually trying to obtain an emblem for patriarchy or masculinity like a Lacanian phallus.[11] His reaction to his father is, in this respect, a hallmark of his secret aspiration for a father.

The most impressive and problematic in the chapter under discussion is its last paragraph which reads: '*My Rosebud*' (98). This is an explicit reference to the 1943 film *Citizen Kane*, at the beginning of which Charles Foster Kane dies reminiscing about a sled named 'Rosebud' that he had to give away in his childhood. With all the wealth and power he later acquires,

Kane cannot regain his Rosebud; he can only summon up the memory of it.[12] Likewise, Dan cannot regain that large black umbrella, *his* Rosebud, and what it stands for: the way of life his father adopted and Dan rejected, the one dominated by the outmoded assumption of morality and social hierarchy. Despite many drawbacks, life with his father on the Devon countryside has a certain appeal to him. Without the abundant vegetation in Devon and his excursion with his father, Dan could never be a plant lover (86-87). The Thorncombe house is not only a reminder of his bitter adolescent experience but a vicarious object for his father's umbrella. Despite his expressed hatred and his attempt to exorcise his father's ghost, Dan tries to regain the memory of, or 'disinter' the body of his father.

In the climactic penultimate scene, Dan feels 'dwarfed' before Rembrandt's self-portrait which is, as several critics agree, the emblem of the aspiration to the whole sight for Dan and Fowles altogether. The Rembrandt portrait offers him two seemingly contradictory images.

> [Dan] could see only one consolation in those remorseless and aloof Dutch eyes. It is not finally a matter of skill, of knowledge, of intellect; of good luck or bad, but choosing and learning to feel. Dan began at least to detect it behind the surface of the painting; behind the sternness lay the declaration of the one true marriage in the mind mankind is allowed, the ultimate citadel of humanism. No true compassion without will, no true will without compassion. (667)

As D. J. Taylor puts it, the 'humanism' in the above extract is so fuzzy as in other English novels governed by 'a conscious ethic or a definite moral atmosphere' in the 1970s.[13] Curiously, the 'humanism' Dan finds in the Rembrandt portrait is attained through the subjection to the watching eyes.

> But Rembrandt's eyes still seemed to follow Dan over the young heads implacably; as many years before, when he was their age, his father had once unwittingly terrified him by insisting that Christ's eyes followed . . . wherever you went, whatever you did, they watched. (667-68)

The transfiguration of Christ into Rembrandt seems strange, indeed; but Christ, or Dan's father's Christ, and Rembrandt somehow merge into the one composite identity, for they play the same role. The Rembrandt image inspires Dan only with fear, and represses every possible reaction with its relentless demand of moral stricture and discipline. The intimidation of this kind can be easily associated with the father figure, with its severity causing a fear and encouraging the formation of the superego. In this respect he recognises in the portrait a spiritual father. *Daniel Martin* is then a story of a man's reconciliation of his father through his exorcism of the father's ghost and eventual disinterment of hidden aspect of him.

3

The main story of this multi-faceted novel is, of course, one of Dan's re-union with Jane Mallory who has one been in love with him and now is married to Anthony, a Catholic scholar and old friend of his. The Dan-Jane story opens up in Anthony's deathbed summon which acts as an invitation that willy-nilly sends Dan off in a new direction. He is not only flying to Oxford but lifted out of the aimlessness of his day-to-day life. Anthony recounts his own failures and then assigns to Dan a difficult task which will surely place him in an awkward situation: he chooses Dan as Jane's 'Good Samaritan', knowing that they have had a one-time affair, *acte gratuit*, before her marriage to Anthony, and that Dan's *drama à clef*, in which he maliciously distorts what has happened, results in a greater rift between them (177-78).

Nevertheless Dan feels impelled to act on Anthony's request mainly for two reasons: the common instinct of humanity obliges him to do so; and Anthony has been special to him because he is 'a kind of father-substitute' to Dan (76).

Despite many differences, Anthony has much in common to Dan's father: desire for safety and order, clerical character and moral stricture, and enthusiasm with botany. Dan's father, an epitome of the Victorian value system, and Anthony, a typical Oxford man, represent a legacy of the previous generation, now more or less obsolete (60). They both made him give up his love (with Nancy and with Jane respectively) through the power and persuasion of their position (his father and a professor-to-be) by which Dan feels strongly mortified (403, 117). Their superior position, the root of their identity and the basis of their dignity, is a vital element for a patriarchal hierarchy. Their resemblance, the older Dan believes, 'would have outraged me at the time, and killed the friendship, as I believed I had consciously "killed" the spirit of my father and his antiquated world' (76). Dan is now split between gratitude and enmity towards this young father-substitute.

> I am trying to say that he was good for me in the sense that he resurrected, if only very tenuously and intermittently, a self—or an unresolved dilemma—I had foolishly tried to dismiss; and nefarious in the sense that our relationship was set in a minefield. (76)

In the extract above appears the image of resurrection of the dead; it points to the fact that Anthony is not only the exact image of, but the resurrection, disinterred corpse of Dan's father. Dan feels his father and Anthony are the same. Dan's attendance at Anthony's deathbed summon is, in this respect, only the beginning of the second stage on a roundabout road that leads to the disinterred corpse of his father.

Being the imaginary Oedipal son to Anthony, Dan unwittingly filters

everything through the paradigm of the Freudian family romance. As Anthony has planned beforehand (he asks Dan to 'help disinter the person Jane might have been from beneath the person she now is' (191)), Dan's trip with Jane through Luxor to Palmyra turns out a series of the progressive revelation of a buried aspect of Jane.[14] Anthony's aim is to correct a 'design failure', to manipulate the situation (191), and to revenge on Madame Sosostris's 'wicked pack of cards', to rewrite their destiny (186). On his part, however, Dan undertakes the 'disinterment' of Jane to achieve his own end: satisfaction of the desire he has nursed so far. This desire is actually two-fold: for one thing, he longs for a re-union with Jane, or the person he might 'disinter' from the middle-aged Jane—the young, vital Jane she used to be and he loved, always associated with her 'one-time whim for Rabelaisian dreamland' (33, 63, 116, 327); for the other, beneath his desire there lies a secret purpose to sublimate his still unresolved problem of Oedipus complex. When he expresses a strong need to show her a love 'in flesh', not in words (422), he can hardly conceal his sexual desire behind his noble remarks (422); he thinks they should have married (361, 568) and, in the later part of the book, actually makes love with her. Nevertheless Jane is a taboo object, for she is Anthony's widow and thus a mother-substitute for Dan. Dan has often attempted to script his mistresses into the role of mother-surrogate (255-56, 582); yet he is always convinced that, of all the women he has met, Jane is the most suitable person to play the role since her marriage to Anthony clearly re-enacted the Freudian paradigm that had shaped Dan's childhood.[15] When he imagines himself sitting with her on 'that remote, forever past, other river bank again' (593), Dan is not merely speaking of the place where Jane may have seduced Dan unless they found the body of a woman (28-29, 64-65); but the woman-in-the-reeds image is a reminder of their lovemaking and its Oedipal by-product—Dan's imaginary triumph over Anthony (99). During his journey with Jane, the 'disinterment' process, Dan does disinter 'that long-ago day in Oxford'

which he has thought died (598) and his old self in the Oedipal phase. It is no accident that Dan calls Oxford 'not a city, but an incest' (162).

Even after his physical death, Anthony continues to have a certain paternal power over Dan; to fulfill the Oedipal attempt, Dan has to exorcise the ghost of Anthony. After his confession on the terrace of an Egyptian hotel, Dan attributes Jane's 'reserve', which he has often associated with Oxford, to the influence of the third person who is always between them: Anthony, their 'familiar compound ghost' (600). Dan's quotation from T. S. Eliot's *Little Gidding* (1943) reminds the reader that the ghost of Anthony, Dan's father-substitute, is also the ghost of Dan's father. This 'compound ghost' has not been 'removed' until Jane eventually accepts his offer of a trip to Palmyra, where he is probably planning to seduce her again (604). Dan dethrones Anthony from his imaginary fatherhood to exorcise the compound ghost. When he is making love to Jane in a room of Hotel Zenobia, Dan remembers a line from *The Waste Land*.

> The wretched dog began barking again somewhere outside, and he thought once more of T. S. Eliot: *oh keep the Dog far hence* . . . but couldn't stop to remember how it went on, conscious of this oddly virginal, willing-unwilling body he felt and held; held against so many recent contradicting public images of her—the don's wife, the poised, the discreet, the middle-aged Englishwoman . . . and now so disconcertingly reduced to a nakedness in more ways than the literal. (636)

The carefully unfinished quotation recalls the omitted lines: 'that's a friend to men, / Or with his nails he'll dig up again!' This passage is an allusion to Cornelia's Dirge in John Webster's *The White Devil*. Dan has in his mind the burial of the dead Anthony; he fears the disinterment of it.[16] Jane is naked 'in more ways than the literal', because she is stripped of both her mask of a

reserved woman and her title as wife to Anthony, wife to the imaginary father to Dan. Her decision to bury her wedding-ring represents a symbolic burial of Anthony (649), and hence a readiness to accept Dan's proposal.[17] The disinterment of Jane, the fulfillment of Anthony's final request, is also the burial-exorcism of Anthony and the 'compound ghost'; and the lovemaking of Dan and Jane adds a final touch to the story of Dan the Oedipal child. Anthony might have attempted at his revenge on Madame Sosostris, but Dan carries out his revenge on his 'familiar compound ghost'. To put this another way, he actually tackles with the problem of his unresolved Oedipal problem, rather than the one of Jane's vitality.

4

Of what use is it to deal with the problem of father-son relationship in terms of the Freudian paradigm, outmoded even in the 1970s when the novel was published? Fowles himself has done the same thing—literary experimentation with psychoanalysis—better in *The Magus*; and he must have known too many episodes should have a clearer function so that *Daniel Martin* could be a condition-of-England novel such as *The Rainbow* by the author he admires most. Conceding all these, however, no doubt the novel produces a strange impression among the more or less politically-minded readers of the 1990s: the father-son problem is somehow connected with the problem of 'Englishness'.

If Forster asks in *Howards End* 'Who shall inherit England?' Fowles must be asking 'What sort of England is worth inheriting?'[18] In the umbrella chapter, the narrator Dan recognises in his father a significant equation between the force and the church: '[Dan's father] was subtle—rather than classic—example of why the military and the ecclesiastical, cross and sword, so often seem just two faces of the same coin' (85). The target of his criticism

is not only a paternal power he has personally fought against, but this two-in-one identity of an Englishman, or more precisely, a citizen of British Empire. From this critical perspective Dan expresses disagreement with the political climate since 1951.

> Even the absurd nostalgia for the imperial and military past that has appeared like a toadstool on rotting wood in recent years (and which I was by no means sure the sceptical line I was taking over Kitchener in my script would counter, though it had been an initial reason I took the thing) springs far less from political conviction than from a puzzled sense that the selfish present is somehow selling us all short. (170)

Dan's father and Kitchener merge in an epitome of the British Empire, whose shadow the new right and the upper-middle-class people are almost blindly following. The harder people pursue 'the fool's gold of instant success' (109), the more confined they are within the framework of the traditional middle-class values for want of a better alternative (246). Despite his anti-establishment artistic creed (223-24), and despite his sympathy for social liberalism which results in his eventual participation in the Labour Party (664), Dan is by no means a radical reformist; he is simply looking for the values that can take the place of the traditional nationalism.[19]

> It had come to Dan often, working on Kitchener—not only in reading the old man's life but in researching all those other lives interwoven with his—that their Britishness, their obsession with patriotism, duty, national destiny, the sacrifice of all personal temperament and inclination (though not personal ambition, of course) to an external system, a quasi-mythical purpose, was profoundly foreign to him, even though he was a myth-maker of sorts himself. Empire was the great disease . . . *aut Caesar, aut*

nullus; and profoundly un-English. The whole nineteenth century was a disease, a delusion called Britain. The true England was freedom to be self, to drift like a spore, to stay unattached to anything, except transiently, but the drifting freedom. (450)

The extract above exemplifies Dan's—Fowles's—ability to illuminate a facet of British imperialism. More importantly, Dan advocates Englishness as opposed to Britishness, the return to Little England as opposed to the British Empire.[20] This accounts for the motive behind his retirement in the Devon countryside; the ghosts he buys and lives with are a representative, or a reminder of Little England. This kind of Englishness is related to the ideology surrounding the notions of freedom and privacy, especially the notion of 'retreat' (290). The 'retreat' Dan speaks of is not an 'onanistic fondling of privacy', which indulges him in avoidance of taking any risks (143-44); but it means the retreat into the realm of imagination, *'la bonne vaux'*, where one can create possible worlds other than the real one (294).[21] This is an excuse for Dan's eventual choice to write a novel, the very English form of art, as opposed to the Hollywood film, a hideous form of Americanism (171).

The retreat into *la bonne vaux*, novel and Little England in Dan's case, does not mean a repudiation of the traditional values or doctrines England has retained; rather, it re-enacts an archaic masculine fantasy and its potential aspiration for patriarchy as well. After receiving a call from Jenny, Dan wants to release himself both from 'female faces' and from his Kitchener script, and then to lock himself up writing a novel about himself: 'an added attraction of the notion of a year's retreat to Thorncombe was its certain echo of that very ancient male dream embodied in Mount Athos and its monasteries' (484). Despite his self-claimed asceticism, the underlying desire is gradually exposed through the cathartic experience at Palmyra and his re-encounter with Jenny: he just wants to leave Jenny for Jane, or more precisely, his sexual instinct

for his once-repressed self. On one hand, this backs up Jenny's view of him as 'the original male-chauvinist pig' (657); it reveals his assumption of male creativity superior to female which naturally brings on a gender-based cold war against a woman like Jenny. On the other, it is clearly an expression of his preference with traditional country life.

Bathotic as it is, the 'happy' ending of the novel provides other evidence of Dan's faith in conservatism. In the last paragraph of the book, Jane is firmly cast as the stock type of a domestic wife: mother confessor and domestic redeemer (668). It reminds the reader of Jenny's insinuation: 'And you'll play Darby and Joan in glorious Devon?' (664) Actually, Dan's crave for a traditional domestic life is increasingly manifested in the stream of his consciousness. At first the rustic character he admires most is Aunt Millie who, even the young Dan realises, is 'very nearly simple-minded' (93) and yet somehow represents a mother figure as domestic rural folk, if Nancy and Jane represent a mother as seductress; his simple aunt is, the older Dan remembers, 'much nearer sainthood than anyone else in my life—the kind of sanctity Flaubert defined for all time in *Un Cœur Simple*' (94). His appraisal of her, together with the commonness of her characterisation, barely escapes sentimentalism. In a much later part of the book, the role of rustic saint is, curiously, assigned to Dan's father. When Dan gains the upper hand from Jenny with his 'gift for tasteful dialogue,' he suddenly remembers his 'buried' past, and senses his father's ghost again.

> There was something else, a much remoter ghost at his shoulder, his father's; all those years of seeing pastoral care in action, and never understanding it, despising it for all the inanities it generated, boring old parties one had to be polite to, endless chitchat over nothing . . . but a greater humanity than this. (662)

The ghost here represents an aspect of the rural life, a kind of the rule of life, which Dan has once neglected as worthless. Although he lays much emphasis on the 'closer ghost' in the following sentences, the re-assessment of the traditional values Dan's father stands for still has a significant implication: the traditional rural life as practice of human wisdom gives a justification for his preference with Little England. Dan's Oedipal past is changed, or rewritten, into a dreamland, and the dull, stubborn preacher into a moral centre. *Daniel Martin*, then, is a story of a man who finally sublimates the Oedipal secret and returns to a spiritual father in a roundabout way and, importantly, throws away the traditional nationalism to regain a mild patriotism. In this respect, Fowles exorcises British Empire and disinters Little England.

The re-discovery of a father and the return to patriotism have significant implications for our understanding of Fowles and of other, mostly modernist, literary texts which have influenced him. In the modernist—or Freudian—age the power relationship in the family has radically changed: the father becomes an outsider or a part of the dismal history of dissolution; and the son is either subject to the influence of the powerful mother, as is evident in Lawrence and Proust, or anxious for the return of the father—whether it is the resurrection of his dead father, as in *The Waste Land*, or the discovery of a spiritual father, as in *Ulysses*.[22] In this respect the modernist story of the son begins with his paternal deprivation. Indeed, *Daniel Martin* supplies a striking contrast with *The Waste Land*, the modernist poem most frequently cited in this novel. In Eliot's poem, part of whose biographical background is the recent death of his own father,[23] the son's desire for the resurrection is somehow destroyed as the quote from Ariel's song 'Those are pearls that were his eyes' is left incomplete (l. 48, 125); the concept of resurrection is often brought up and secularised, but the resurrection does

not occur as Alonso's phantasmagorical reappearance—for Ferdinand, it is the resurrection of the father—takes place in *The Tempest*. Beneath *The Waste Land* underlies the pessimistic assumption that everyone is thrown into emptiness, irreconcilably separated from anyone else, and that the resurrection, or the rebirth aspect of the vegetative myth, is but a nonsense.[24] In *Daniel Martin*, however, Dan does re-discover a father. Eliot goes further to forecast, in 'The Hollow Men', the end of the world symbolised in a 'whimper'; yet in *Daniel Martin*, the 'whimper' of the puppies in the Syrian desert, with its mother's 'distraction behaviour', signals a potential new beginning—Dan and Jane do begin a new life, having buried the ghost of Anthony (648-49).[25] The final vision is more optimistic, and the trust in the father is greater here than in Eliot. Working out of the modernist tradition, Fowles places Dan in a similar wasteland; yet he gives him a solution, the way out of the wasteland towards a pastoral dreamland, or the green Devon countryside.

Eliot contrasts an idyllic past with a sordid present; Fowles adds to it a possible idyllic future. *The Waste Land* engages us in tracking down the source of fragments from dead poets strewn on its textual surface, until we find ourselves among the cultural ruins; with Eliot, the reader disinters the dead who cannot live again. On the other hand, *Daniel Martin* is an attempt to disinter an aspect of them which is living within us; the 'compound ghost' of a spiritual father and Little England actually becomes the moral centre of a considerable number of English writers such as Lindsay Clarke, Graham Swift, and Adam Thorpe.[26] In this respect we are living with the dead Fowles disinters in *Daniel Martin*.

Notes

[1] For further discussion of the ending of the modernist fiction, Steven G. Kellman, 'The Fiction of Self-Begetting', *Modern Language Notes* 91. 6 (Winter 1976): 1245.

[2] John Fowles, *Daniel Martin* (1977. London: Triad Grafton, 1985), 668. All further

references to this work will appear with parentheses.

[3] Susana Onega, *Form and Meaning in the Novels of John Fowles* (Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Research P, 1989), 99

[4] Gray Kochhar-Lindgren, *Narcissus Transformed: The Textual Subject in Psychoanalysis and Literature* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State UP, 1993), 102.

[5] John Fowles, *The Magus: A Revised Version* (1977. New York: Dell, 1985), 156.

[6] Kochhar-Lindgren 104.

[7] Katherine Tarbox, *The Art of John Fowles* (Athens, GA: U of Georgia P, 1988), 114-15; Onega 116; Thomas C. Foster, *Understanding John Fowles* (Columbia, SC: U of South Calorina P, 1994), 125.

[8] *The Magus* 517.

[9] Sigmund Freud, 'Negation' (1925), tr. James Riviere, in *On Metapsychology: The Theory of Psychoanalysis*, ed. Angela Richards (London: Penguin, 1991), 437-38.

[10] Bruce Woodcock, *Male Mythologies: John Fowles and Masculinity* (Brighton: Harvester, 1984), 127, 129.

[11] Woodcock 127.

[12] Tarbox 94-95.

[13] D. J. Taylor, *After the War: The Novel and England Since 1945* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1993), 184-85.

[14] Simon Loveday, *The Romances of John Fowles* (London: Macmillan, 1985), 125.

[15] Woodcock 133.

[16] Carol Barnum, 'John Fowles's *Daniel Martin*: A Vision of the Whole Sight', *Literary Review* 25. 1 (1981): 76.

[17] Barnum 77-78.

[18] Foster 131.

[19] Dan is essentially a liberalist; and so is Fowles, despite his clear expression of commitment to socialism that runs through *The Aristos*. Andrzej Gasiorek, *Post-War British Fiction: Realism and After* (London: Edward Arnold, 1995), 118-19.

[20] Spender refers to 'the poetic little Englandism' as a patriotism combined with ruralism which re-appeared in the 1950s. Stephen Spender, *Love-Hate Relations: A Study of Anglo-American Sensibilities* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1974), 106.

[21] For further discussion of Fowles's notion of *la bonne vaux*, see Ishrat Lindblad, '"*La bonne vaux*", "*la princesse lointaine*": Two Motifs in the Novels of John Fowles', in *Studies in English Philology, Linguistics and Literature Presented to Alarik Rynell, 7 March 1978*, ed. Mats Rydén and A. Bjørk (Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiskell

International, 1978), 87-101.

[22] Ricardo J. Quinones, *Mapping Literary Modernism: Time and Development* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1985), 53-55.

[23] Miller argues that *The Waste Land* is an elegy for Jean Verdenal who once lived in the same boarding house as Eliot, and suggests there might have been a homosexual feeling between them. James E. Miller, Jr., *T. S. Eliot's Personal Waste Land* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State UP, 1977). As many reviewers of Miller have pointed out, however, more evidence is needed to make the case; it should be much more rational to detect in *The Waste Land* the marks of Eliot's own nervous breakdown caused by his own father's death and his first wife's mental sickness. For Eliot's biographical information, see Peter Ackroyd, *T. S. Eliot* (1984. London: Cardinal, 1989), esp., 109-29.

[24] Brooker recognises the same bleak vision in W. H. Auden's 1948 essay 'Yeats as an Example', and concludes, with Auden, that modernist writers are forced to work in a mythic vacuum where nothing but myth can be shared. Jewel Spears Brooker, *Mastery and Escape: T. S. Eliot and the Dialectic of Modernism* (Amherst, MA: U of Massachusetts P, 1994), 110-11.

[25] Barnum 77-78.

[26] Bradbury discusses the return of ruralism since the 1980s, although he leaves out Swift. Malcolm Bradbury, *The Modern British Novel* (1993. London: Penguin, 1994), 415.